UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,061	07/31/2003	Robert E. Richard	02-321	9972
27774 MAYER & WII	7590 05/19/200 LLIAMS PC	EXAMINER		
251 NORTH A	VENUE WEST	SIMMONS, CHRIS E		
2ND FLOOR WESTFIELD, I	NJ 07090	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1612	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/19/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/632,0	061	RICHARD ET AL.				
		Examine	er	Art Unit				
		CHRIS E	E. SIMMONS	1612				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
2a)⊠ This a 3)⊡ Since	onsive to communication(s) file ction is FINAL . this application is in condition I in accordance with the pract	2b)☐ This action is for allowance excep	non-final. ot for formal matters, pr		e merits is			
Disposition of	Claims							
4a) Of 5) ☐ Claim 6) ☑ Claim 7) ☐ Claim 8) ☐ Claim Application Pa 9) ☐ The sp	(s) 1-9,11-20 and 22-27 is/are the above claim(s) is/a (s) is/are allowed. (s) 1-9,11-20 and 22-27 is/are (s) is/are objected to. (s) are subject to restrict pers ecification is objected to by the awing(s) filed on is/are	e rejected. ction and/or election ne Examiner.	onsideration. requirement.	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
2) ☐ Notice of Dra 3) ☑ Information □	erences Cited (PTO-892) ftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (bisclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Mail Date <u>2/5/2009 and 3/17/2009</u> .		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate				

Art Unit: 1612

DETAILED ACTION

Obviousness Rejections

Claims 1-7, 9-20, 22-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2002/0107330 in view of US 2003/0236514. **This** rejection is maintained.

Applicant asserts that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made because the '514 reference is limited to maleic anhydride graft copolymers and does not provide the motivation to make the acrylic graft copolymers in the instant claims. This argument is not found to be persuasive because the maleic anhydride copolymers for practice of the reference invention include graft copolymers in addition to containing acrylic copolymers, e.g., acrylic acids [0010 - 0011].

It would be reasonably expected that one could successfully make the drug-releasing implantable medical devices of the primary reference by using equivalents of the copolymers of the primary reference. Graft copolymers are disclosed as alternative equivalents to alternating copolymers in the secondary reference at [0011] and [0049]. Accordingly, the skilled artisan would have found it obvious to make the copolymer compositions of the primary reference using graft copolymers as equivalents to alternating copolymers disclosed in the primary reference having the motivation of a reasonable expectation of successfully making the composition using one copolymer equivalent for another.

Art Unit: 1612

Since a reference is good for all it teaches, including nonpreferred embodiments, applicant's assertion that the figures in the reference are directed to random copolymers containing styrene instead of graft polymers containing acrylic units are not found to be persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it is submitted that so long as knowledge relied upon is from within the level of ordinary skill at the time of the invention instead of only relying on knowledge from the applicant's disclosure, then the obviousness rejection is proper. In this case, the examiner has not relied solely on the instant specification, but the reasons for obviousness arise from objective facts found in the prior art; therefore, applicant's assertion that examiner is using hindsight reasoning is not found to be persuasive.

Claims 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2002/0107330 and US 2003/0236514, the combination taken further in view of WO 2000/061203. **This rejection is maintained**.

Applicant argues that since the tertiary reference is, unlike the currently claimed invention, directed to devices that are metallic in composition. Applicant further argues that the elongation value of a metal to the elongation value of a polymeric material is not relevant to patentability. The examiner does not find the arguments to be persuasive because the open "comprising" language in the claims does not preclude the presence of a metallic material. Even more importantly, the importance of the reference is in its disclosure of the importance

Application/Control Number: 10/632,061

Art Unit: 1612

of the mechanical properties of the stent, including its elasticity and elongation value to provide a product that is sufficient for its intended use, for example a stent for use in arteries. The reference was cited for its disclosure that elongation values above 8 % (including values above 20 % or 30 %) - suggesting the instant limitation of an elongation value of above 25 % - are sufficient to provide favorable mechanical properties to devices such as stents.

Claims 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2002/0107330 and US 2003/0236514, the combination taken further in view of USP 5,837,313. **This rejection is maintained.**

It appears applicant argued that the primary reference does not teach every limitation of the claims. Since the rejection is an obviousness rejection, it is not required to find every limitation in a single reference. Accordingly, the argument is not found to be persuasive.

No claims allowed.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1612

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRIS E. SIMMONS whose telephone number is (571)272-9065. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30 - 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frederick Krass can be reached on (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/632,061 Page 6

Art Unit: 1612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. E. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 1612

/Frederick Krass/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612